

**REMARKS**

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the points raised in the September 17, 2007 final Office Action. Upon entry of the above amendments, Claim 1 will have been amended, Claims 3, 6, 7, and 9-18 will have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 will be pending. No new matter has been introduced. No issues have been raised that require further consideration or search. Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

**Response to the Objection to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification on the basis of various identified informalities.

Applicants have amended the specification in view of the Examiner's comments and suggestions to obviate the objection. Applicants thank the Examiner for his helpful suggestions. The Examiner's suggestion directed to Page 13, Line 27, of the specification, however, was incorporated in Applicants' Amendment filed June 11, 2007.

Accordingly, the objection to the specification is now moot and should be withdrawn.

**Response to the Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 on the basis that the Claim 1 language of “‘shortage of excess’ should be – shortage of or excess --.”

Applicants have amended Claim 1 in view of the Examiner's comments and suggestion to obviate the objection. Applicants thank the Examiner for his helpful suggestion.

Accordingly, the objection to Claim 1 is now moot and should be withdrawn.

**Response to the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of US Patent 4,685,139 to Masuda et al. (hereinafter “Masuda”), US Patent 4,975,971 to Ohnishi, and US Patent 6,535,521 to Fujita. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuda, Ohnishi, and Fujita, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of US Patent 5,999,636 to Juang. Applicants traverse these rejections and respectfully submit that neither Masuda, Ohnishi, Fujita, nor Juang, either alone or in combination, teach, suggest, or would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the disclosures of Masuda, Ohnishi, Fujita, and Juang, alone or in combination, as advanced by the Examiner and arrive at the subject matter recited in Applicants’ claims.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of inspecting a printed paper on which images are printed repeatedly that includes predetermining the thresholds (a) and (b) of lowest stained density and highest blurred density and the limits (c) and (d) of minus of differential density and plus of differential density, for inspection of stained parts and blurred parts and inspection of shortage and excess of printed density. In addition, according to the invention, the inspection of stained parts and blurred parts is dependent on the comparison of the monochrome images of inspection with the monochrome images of references while the inspection of shortage and excess of printed density is dependent on the comparison of the multi valued data of inspection with the multi valued data of reference.

In order to make the distinction between the inspection of stained parts and blurred parts and the inspection of shortage and excess of printed density without difficulty, the subject matter recited in Applicants’ claims executes the inspection and decision of stained and blurred parts

and the inspection and decision of shortage and excess of printed density simultaneously and accurately. In this case, the limit (c) of minus of differential density is disposed above the threshold (a) of lowest stained density while the limit (d) of plus of differential is disposed below the threshold (b) of highest blurred density.

The subject matter recited in Applicants' claims includes recognizing whether the monochrome images of inspection include portions disagreeing with the monochrome images of reference or not, where the portions are positioned and what areas the portions have, and deciding on stained parts or blurred parts when the portions have areas exceeding the areas for decision of stained parts or blurred parts. In this connection, such areas comprise the collection of adjacent disagreeing pixels, that is X1 to Xn and Y1 to Yn pixels. Furthermore, the subject matter recited in Applicants' claims also includes deciding on stained parts and blurred parts by the positions and areas of monochrome images. As a result, the method recited in Applicants' claims commits hardly an error of decision.

The applied references of Masuda, Ohnishi, Fujita, and/or Juang do not include any teaching or suggestion as to the above features recited in Applicants' claims, e.g., the limit (c) of minus of differential density is disposed above the threshold (a) of lowest stained density while the limit (d), plus of differential density is disposed below the threshold (b) of highest blurred density, and/or the predetermined areas for decision comprise the collection of adjacent disagreeing pixels. As such, the subject matter recited in Applicant independent Claim 1, as well as dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, and 8, is distinguished over the applied references of Masuda, Ohnishi, Fujita, and/or Juang, either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8, are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 0140-4222.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 12, 2008

By:



Brian W. Brown  
Registration No. 47,265  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101